Professors Duke It Out

By C. ELIESSE

Last Friday, during a monthly facul-
ty meeting, Professors Peller and Tushnet got into a nasty brawl, prov-
ing once and for all, that the pen is
not mightier than the sword. Ten-
sions had been brewing with Tush-
net two years, ever since their faculty dispute first surfaced in the Georgetown Law Journal.

The altercation began after Pro-
fessor Tushnet said, "Hello, Gary," as Peller walked into the facul-
ty lounge. Peller, however, thought Tushnet had said, "Hello, Larry," and that that was some joke.

Comparing Peller to the failed McLean Stevenson series of the early '80s. Before Dean Areen would even spring into action, Peller had ripped off his nicotine patch and sent Tushnet to the ground.

Normally a peace-loving, anti-death penalty faculty quickly took sides, plac-
ing bets on who would win.

Professors from the quick thinker, picked up the phone to con-
tact his agent so he'd book him on CNN that night. But, before Rentstein could get to the second digit, Dean Areen, with Professor Weidenbruch, had knocked him unconscious and rammaged through his wallet. "Bad driver's license photo," Weidenbruch thought to himself.

Meanwhile, the Peller/Tushnet slugfest had intensified, with both yelling, "Children are not dead, you fool." Peller responded, "Well, your class is the only one that made mine seem coherent." By this time, Professor Eskridge had taken over emote duties, giving the play-by-play for the excited crowd. "Oh, that will make a nasty scar on Gary's cheek. I guess he'll have to go to the barbershop. But, what will mark do without a spleen?"

As luck would have it, Friday was also the day prospective students were visiting the campus. It was al-
most too much for Andy Correll to bear. Inspired by the visionary film, "Falling Down," Correll went into his office and retrieved the pistol he'd brought to be in the David Koch's own hand, and every one of the school's 10,000 applicants. Correll entered the faculty lounge and ordered Peller and Tushnet to stop.

But, Correll wasn't the only one who'd been to the movies, recently. Dean Areen had just seen "Point of No Return." She droppedkick Correll and ordered, "Nobody move." "I've been trying to get rid of these two for years," she said, "and no one is going to prevent my dream from coming true."

"Stop you!" the crowd replied. "We'll help you. It's people like them that keep our rankings among acad-
emics so low in the U.S. News & World Report. We owe it to our stu-
dents to get rid of these blemishes on our illustrious institution. In fact, it's long overdue!"

"But, how can we do it and not get caught?" asked a nervous Professor Ernst. " simple, " We'll tell the press that they've been missing for weeks and that they are believed to be in the David Koch's own hand."

At the time the ATF bombs that place, no one will be identifiable." The other professors giggled with glee and promptly put in requests for the now vacant office space.

Gulfong Disciplined; Renbaum, Gonzalez Charged

By L. C. RENBAUM

The Georgetown Law administra-
tion apparently does not take a joke
very well. Dr. Randall Furlong, a sec-
ond year evening student and Law
Weekly staff member has been disci-
plined by the administration's ethics committee for the use of the term "Georgetown Law Review" on the weekly columns he writes for the Law
Weekly.

The administration felt that Furlong's self appointment as "edi-
tor in chief of the Georgetown Law Review" constitutes violation of the school's honor code. In a written statement, the committee decided that Dr. Furlong's creation of the Georgetown Law Review constitutes a deliberate effort to get himself as achieving a significant position that usually denotes merit.

An examination of Dr. Furlong's record at Georgetown shows that nothing could be further from the truth. The administration also called into question Furlong's use of the address "Doctor" in his column and on his resume. Furlong apparently only re-
ed an honorary Ph.D., and may be expelled from the school for rep-
resenting himself as a holder of such an advanced degree.

In his appeal to the dean, Dr. Furlong will be represented by Pro-
fessor Gerry Spann, who will defend Furlong by consistently asking Dean Areen "Yes, but is that right?" to every statement she makes. Furlong has chosen Professor Spann because of Spann's relentless technique of answering questions with questions, a proven successful court and class-
room strategy, geared to put more dates, drives a better car, and is generally more well-
liked by their peers.

Chief witnesses for the Law Weekly editors will include Wendy Kilbride, Jim Black, and Suzanne Maltsa, who are all listed as editors but have actu-
ally never met each other. To pro-
ve that editing the Law Weekly is just another form of self-promotion, Joss Less and Joe Rand will enter approaches at the hearing on be-
half of Lawrence Renbaum (a.k.a. Larenbaum) where the three of them will spout forth for hours about in-
flated egos, which one of them is funnier, and which one went to a better college, served on a better journal, etc. The three will keep on such a thread that the committee will find that the Law Weekly is not a newspaper afterall, but a way for certain law students to gain celeb-
rity and notoriety her at Georgetown Law.

Seidman Leading Tribe for Supreme Court

By L. C. RENBAUM

Georgetown's resident Constitu-
tional law expert, Professor Michael Seidman, apparently has the edge over Harvard's Larry Tribe in the race to fill the opening on the Supreme Court left by retiring Justice Byron White. President Clinton is set to announce this week that he will nomi-
nate Seidman to the post, once Seidman passes his FBI background check.

It was believed that Harvard's Larry Tribe would get the position, since he is best known for his book on Constitutional law (West Publishing). However, sources at the White House report that when compared to the Stone, Seidman Constitutional law casebook (Little, Brown), the Seidman book is both longer and heavier. Further research proved that the Seidman casebook also displaces a greater volume of water than the Tribe hornbook.

Believing that taller does not al-
ways mean better, the White House apparently is sticking with Seidman for the nomination. When contacted, Professor Seidman would only say that "this is news to me, but I always knew that height isn't everything." Seidman, who clerked for the Su-
preme Court in the 1970's, is also a front-runner because he knows the building so well.

In an apparent confirmation of Seidman's impending nomination, President Bill Clinton said at last week's press conference that he "ex-
pects to have a short list ready for next week," obviously referring to Seidman's height. President Clinton also remarked that "I think it's about time we had a Supreme Court justice who not only wrote the book on Con-
stitutional law, but one who forces every law student at Georgetown to buy it, some even twice." Many third year law students have bought both the original casebook and the sec-
ond edition during their GULC years.

Some Harvard students are dis-
puting the strength of Seidman's casebook over Tribe's hornbook, and are planning a series of protests in Cambridge this week. They contend that the tests used were "socially constructed to give Seidman the edge." The Harvard students say that Tribe's hornbook is the superior measure because it is easier to carry with other books in your knapsack.

Seidman's quotes Tribe.
Letters to the Editor

Fish Rapping

To The Editors:

The Georgetown Law 'Weekly' has rare flashes of brilliance in its sea of otherwise stilted and vapid sophomorisms from the perpetually indignant. This is the only reason, other than wrapping fish, that I (and I would assume most students) ever pick it up.

The issue of March 22 contained a quarter-panel block, "celebrating" the resignation of Supreme Court Justice Byron White. This sentiment was unsigned, leading the reader to believe that it was an editorial comment, or that the sponsors did not (understandably) wish to take credit for their eloquent elegy cheering the retirement of such an "evil conservative."

In either case, the Law 'Weekly' has outdone itself in shirkling editorial integrity and journalistic responsibility. The "editorial" is neither relevant to its target nor to the news. Those who take the time to do the research may find that even the newspapers I have ever read. Opinions expressed on the editorial page, aside from letters to the editor, are not necessarily those of the members or members of the editorial board.

Because you disagree with the sentiment, you question its validity. Fortunately, the Law 'Weekly' has never shared your view, as we publish everything that is submitted to us without regard to our personal views.

Lastly, we appreciate your concern and suggestion for reducing our "filler" space. However, it is our editorial judgment that the Law 'Weekly's" funding and financial statements" are not nearly as interesting or controversial as you may imagine.

While all suggestions are welcome, the Law 'Weekly' prefers that readers help remedy any "filler" problem by writing letters to the editor (as you have done) and/or by writing full articles.

---

Adam G. Clongoli
Editor-in-Chief

---

CALS: The Downside

To The Editor:

We are writing to comment on last week's article by a former student in the Culture for Applied Legal Studies (CALS). We too took CALS during the fall semester and had many positive experiences. But, unfortunately, we had many negative experiences as well.

On the positive side, clinical education provided us with a terrific opportunity to represent actual clients, to participate in litigation, and to put into practice the theoretical concepts that law school students spend so much time learning. A clinic is an invaluable and exciting supplement to traditional classroom learning, and Georgetown is to be commended for running one of the largest (and the highest ranked) clinical programs in the country.

On the negative side, however, we wish we had selected a different clinic. First, the quality of student experiences varies dramatically depending on which professors and fellows you happen to draw as advisors and on the uneven nature of the cases assigned. The instructors and cases you receive are simply "luck-of-the-draw."

Second, CALS stresses that its pedagogical approach is "non-directive" as a positive facet of the clinic, but the flip side is that it often provides inadequate guidance. Furthermore, the clinic prides itself on its focus on "interpersonal skills" and "group dynamics," but that is not necessarily a strong point. We spent endless time engaged in unproductive discussions about how students in the course relate to each other instead of more profitably studying what make us spend time on litigation training. Moreover, despite the outward emphasis on open communication, the atmosphere was such that students felt uncomfortable voicing criticisms.

Fourth, CALS expects its students to focus on the clinic to the exclusion of everything else. Even during exam period, one student described how her project for the course had to be prioritized to her ongoing casework. After exams were over, she said she felt her grade might suffer if she left for Christmas break as she had planned. Another group of students spent a month working 80-100 hour weeks.

Fifth, the grading is subjective and wildly unpredictable, a significant consideration in a 6-credit course. (One student received a C, at least two others received B-; all of whom received their cases successfully.)

Despite these drawbacks, we learned a great deal from CALS, but would not repeat the course.

---

Jeffrey Adler
Sara Courtney
Lucy Martin

---
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Down with Marc Sorini

To The Editor:

What the fuck is up with Marc Sorini? He doesn't get to listen to the sound of his own voice babbling on and on in class day after day, week after week, torturing everyone around him with his "ideas." (Marc never had a thought he didn't think was brilliant) enough, he also has to subject us to his drivel in print? Can you say narcissism?

Marc? Can the loser who yammers on "cleverly" about the word guf-few really think he is a closet nerd?

Marc, did you ever stop to think that

everyone (yes, everyone) might find you very ANNOYING? You can take the boy out of Heckensack, but you can't take Heckensack out of the boy, P.S. and wipe that stupid smirk off your face.

Name Withheld by Request

---

Turn to Page 3 for one last (but no least) letter to the editor.
Letters to the Editor

The Death of the Experiment

I am a proud alumnus of Section Three 1991-92, the first year of the experimental section. Upon deciding to participate in the experiment, we were told that we were to be the guinea pigs for a grand experiment, an experiment that very well could revolutionize legal education. We were also told that it was controversial, that various student members of the legal community were opposed to any changes in the time honored traditions of the first year curriculum. Needless to say, we were a little hesitant, some more than others. After all, a lot rests upon the first year of law school. But we were willing to give it a go. We had faith.

During the school year, we had our second thoughts. Again, some more than others. (One person went so far as to demand a refund for one of the classes because he was so dissatisfied.) But we stuck it out. Our complaints were aired as suggestions for improvement because improvement was what we wanted. To us the experiment was a success, but that is not to say that it could not have been better. The liberals had their problems with it (such as feminist and minority positions being given short shrift) and the conservatives had their problems with it (such as law and economics being discounted), but for the most part we were happy.

Now less that a year after I finished the experiment, I have heard a very disturbing rumor: The professors are leaving. I thought it had to be a joke for how could they leave just when the experiment was coming into full swing. Yet, I have heard from relatively reliable sources that Prof. Tushnet, Prof. Eskridge, and Prof. Seidman will all be visiting elsewhere next year. Have they abandoned the experiment? Has it failed? Or, are they bored with it?

As this disturbing news was sinking in, I heard even more disturbing news. Prof. Peller, a member of the original cast of the experimental section although replaced this year by Prof. Gottesman, has been forbidden by the administration from ever teaching first years again. Why? Granted he was not always as prepared for class as he could have been, but when he was on, he was on fire. Does the administration think his ideas are too radical or too dangerous to expose first years to? Even if his class "gates" only ten percent of what he tries to teach, his teaching remains very valuable (not to swell his already large head). It is a shame that future students will be denied the chance to learn under him, and that his teaching can be silenced by a minority of close-minded and bitter former students.

Thus I am sad that the experiment, in general, and Prof. Peller, in particular, have been abandoned.

Rob Rogers, 2L

Mayhem at Barristers’ Ball

BY SUE MASTER

Perhaps the Blizzard of ’93 was a message to the SBA to cancel its annual Barristers’ Ball, but, sadly, they did not heed the warning. In what was described as “a rumble to make Pinky Tussard groan,” dozens of partygoers sustained serious injuries at the French Embassy, last Friday.

Why did it happen? Some have speculated that it was a plot by the French government, who blame America’s rejection of the Republican party for the Socialist government’s recent losses in French elections (“We always do the exact opposite of what you stupid Americans,” the Ambassador explained). Others, though, thought the culprit was the SBA’s own president, Rajiv Parikh, who, much like Sissy Spacek’s “Carrie,” sought to take it out on his classmates when, for the second year in a row, he was forced to go to the Barristers’ Ball dateless.

“I did nothing, I swear,” Parikh told the Law Weekly’s Jim Black. “I’m being framed by the Law Center power brokers. First, they unload the yearbook on me. Now, they’re trying to frame me with their plan to get rid of the excess student body.”

The Law Weekly’s own star editor, Wendy Kilbride, recently wooed by the New Yorker to replace Tina Brown, was in attendance at the Ball. “It wasn’t that bad, until Tipper Gore’s body did that double split thing. Coming from a gymnastics background, I was impressed, but, of course, I felt for her.”

Already, the Gores have announced their intentions to sue the Law Center, which, according to Dean Areen, means that tuition will be increasing by 1266%. Said Tipper, “How will I ever be able to dance as cool as I did at the MTV ball, again?”

Sadly, Marc Sorin, a frequent contributor to the Law Weekly, sustained the most serious of injuries. Sorin, who was performing at the Ball with his band, the Ambulance Chasers (the real band cancelled), lost both the ability to write and the ability to speak in class. The Law Weekly has set up a fund for Marc’s medical bills and has already collected $198. In weeks to come, many will ask what could have been done differently.

A thought occurs to this reporter: next year don’t invite Ozis as party favors.

--

Weekly Crossword

"Oscar Time" By Garry Frey

ACROSS
1 Vehicle VIP
5 Apple lightly
9 Linen, or a kind
13 Shear's Head
15 Computer language
16 1992 Academy Award winner
18 Pay off
20 Pakistan lion
21 LUSBURY
22 Robert & Peggy
23 Video
24 Leave helplessly
27 Doused
28 Sacrificed a
31 Caribbean island
32 Old
33 Color type
34 1854 Academy Award winner
37 1977 wedding
38 Try it
39 On the roost 5, 6, 7
40 Free companion
41 Puleo's Michelle, eg.
42 Cooper & Payne
43 May
44 Otherwise
46 M. Tamarind
48 Madele 1947 novel
49 Might have been 7
52 1992 Academy Award winner
55 Maryland player
56 Trends 2, 5, 2, 5, 2, 5
56 Orange sweet potatoes
58 Count
60 Minstrel
61 Screen
62 Famous possum
63 Armrest
64 Coen
65 Bigger fist size
67 Palm trees

DOWN
2 Lotus
4 Arthur from本市
5 High in the air
6 Magic
7 Not yet
8 Selling
9 Ess & Rebecca
10 "Fifty" author
11 "Third" author
12 Carrot juice
13 Carrot salad
14 Period of time
15 Hammer's Slag
16 Sportsman
17 Shopping machine
18 Dessert
19 Convex figure
20 Take a photograph
21 Dance
22 Creative writer
23 Campaigns
26 Crow's croucher
27 Apothecary
28 Don't let the Leans
30 Pizzicato
32 Lodge
33 Statue
34 Palate
35 Faux
38 John Q. Cover's pension
41 Never's nest
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"BROKEN CONTRACT" should be read by every bright mind even remotely contemplating law school. It's much more than a memoir. It's a brutally honest picture of how law schools transform students into grotesques." — John Grisham, author of The Firm

Georgetown's Student Bar Association and Faber and Faber, Inc., Publishers, invite you to an afternoon with

RICHARD KAILENBERG
author of

BROKEN CONTRACT: A MEMOIR OF HARVARD LAW SCHOOL

speaking on

At a Crossroads: The Intersection Between Public-Interest Law and Law School Politics Today

THURSDAY, APRIL 15
MOOT COURT ROOM
4.p.m.

Faber and Faber, Inc., Publishers
HOME COURT IV: Worth It, Despite the Score

By ELIAS ELIOPOULOS

Both the Law Center Hoyas Lawyers and the Hill's Angels Congressional squad looked fearsome as they warmed up before the start of Homecourt. Balls swished through hoops from all directions.

But when the game started, the trend continued for only one of the teams. The members of Congress never trailed and defeated your favorite GUCLC faculty, 58-29. The sixth annual Homecourt basketball game drew its largest crowd ever to the Gonzaga High School Gym on Wednesday, March 24.

The game may have been less than aesthetically pleasing, but it was the culmination of Homecourt’s most successful fundraising drive yet. At halftime, Homecourt student directors Karen Kelleher and Mike Delaney were able to present a check for $109,000 to the Washington Legal Clinic for the Homeless, a not-for-profit corporation dedicated to providing free legal services to homeless individuals and families in D.C. The total was more than compensated for the lopsided score.

The faculty was philosophical in defeat. “It’s a great cause... though I’d have liked the score to be closer,” said Head Coach Krattenmaker. “It’s like Representative Lane Evans said, ‘you guys were just cold tonight.’ Our strategy for next year is to get hot.”

Unfortunately, the Lawyers’ inadequacies were only part of the problem. The members of Congress shot and played defense and passed the ball without regard to party affiliation. They scored the game’s first 7 points before Dean Bellamy broke the faculty’s drought with a foul-line jumper. Hill’s Angels led at the half, 28-11. And the second half was basically a repeat.

Representative Lane Evans (D-IL) turned over the game’s momentum, scoring from the left and the right. The Hill’s Angels were led by Rep. Ed Markey (D-MA) with 9 points. Rep. Charles Schumer (D-NY) and Rep. Thomas Barrett (D-WI) added 8 and 7 respectively.

The game was sloppily played, for many reasons. For one, the white t-shirts worn by the Lawyers were virtually indistinguishable from the Angels’ light gray t-shirts. That may have explained why there was a lot of passing to the wrong team.

In addition, the two celebrity referees, Washington Redskins Moe Elewonde and Ray Brown, made little use of their whistles. So there was a decent amount of slapping and flying elbows. But Moe and Ray were, in a word, big, so no one questioned their judgment. (This was actually in stark contrast to last year’s game, also won by the Angels, in which there were a number of technical fouls. In fact, one member of Congress was ejected after drawing two technicals, including one for kicking at a faculty member while he was on the floor.)

With the outcome seemingly predetermined, many fans followed other story lines. These are just a sample:

Question: Would Prof. Krattenmaker recover after taking a blow to his noggin’ early in the game?
Answer: Yes.
Question: Would the student rep.

Dean Areen—Supreme Court Nominee?

BY TOM BRADFORD

Judith Areen, Dean of the Law Center and Influential lawyer, is at the top of President Clinton’s short list to replace the retiring Justice Byron White on the Supreme Court, the Washington Post reported, last week.

Sources say that the Clintons got to know Dean Areen very well since moving to Washington, D.C., thanks in large part to the Law Center’s Peter Edelman. Areen and her husband recently joined the Clintons and Edelmans in southern California, where they all stayed with Linda Bloom and her husband and Harry Thomas. “It was nothing, really,” Areen said the Law Weekly’s Jim Black at the time. “We played Hearts and talked about Delta Burke.”

Areen, if appointed to the Court, is expected to reverse the direction the Court has taken in recent years. She will probably move the Court toward finding a textual basis for not allowing Catholic universities to dictate how their law schools should be run, and she will most likely advocate the death penalty for anyone who says that she looks like Joan Rivers.

As asked to comment on Clinton’s likely nominee, Justice Souter said, “Oh, that’s nice. I’m sure mother will like her.” Others were not so kind, however. Justice Scalia exclaimed, “Another woman! First, we included them in the Constitution. Now, they’ll probably want two stools in the Court bathrooms.” Areen, though, would probably not have to deal with Scalia for very long, as it was recently revealed that she suffers from an over-inflated ego that could rupture at any time.

Student at the Law Center will miss Areen, too, under her tenure, brought the Center to new highs, especially the tuition department.

Law Students in Court

BY U.R. BEANSCROOD

Are you sick of the Law Center using you as free labor in the clinical program? Well, so am I, which is why, with the money I made from selling the furniture the foolish powers that be have left down in the garage, I’ve started a clinic by students and for students. Law Students in Court represents law students who have fallen on the wrong side of the law.

Is the phone company harassing you just because you haven’t paid in three months? Did the Domino’s delivery man refuse to give you a free pizza even though he was over 30 minutes late? Did the D.C. parking police arrest you when you told them to fuck off? Did the Registrar refuse to take your check just because it was postdated to the year 2024? Well, you have rights, and we’ll see sure they are protected.

Of course, Homecourt went beyond the game itself. To raise money for the Legal Clinic, which provided assistance for over 1,500 homeless people in 1992, the Law Center community hosted a carnival, sold t-shirts, conducted an auction, and held a “change for the homeless” drive. Thanks to the tireless efforts of students, faculty and staff, Homecourt’s contribution easily surpassed last year’s total of $93,000. It was easily the biggest swish of the night.
Three Arrested in Barristers' Disasters

By GREG BRADY

Friday night's Barristers' Ball at the glamarous French Embassy was not a "happy time for all" to the couple of rowdy roughneck law students. What seemed like a wondrous night of peace and quiet quickly turned into a night of chaos and horror as hands turned into fists and blood ran freely (like the cheap red wine we were all drinking). It all began when a group of 1L's started arguing over which section was really the experimental one. Several 2L's started saying that all the 1L's were experiments of one form or another and things quickly got ugly. When two French security guards tried to stop the shoving match between Jason Allison (1L, Stanford) and Marc Young (2L, Yale), the crowd of drunks turned on the French, yelling obscenities and pouring alcohol. A third security guard jumped in and punched Lisa Wells (1L, Duke) in the nose. She tried to pull him off her head, Dave Becknor (3L, G-Town), who was pushing one of the other security guards. It was at about this point that people began to scatter as the punches started to fly. A few minutes later, D.C.'s finest were hauling off prisoners from what had to be the greatest battle in Barristers' Ball history.

In the end, Becknor, along with Joe Lopez (1L, Ga. Tech) and Carla Smith (1L, LSU), were the only ones arrested despite the participation of at least 10 people in the brawl that left two seriously injured. Becknor, who commented from his jail cell on Saturday, said that the French were pressing for a "stiff sentence" because they are "upset over some new tax" and "they want to make [someone] pay for it." Becknor added that he wants someone from the Criminal Justice Clinic to get [his] ass outta [the jail] before [he] gets [explosive] killed." Lopez, whose father is a judge in Maryland, was released the same evening after questioning regarding a missing bottle of whiskey. And Smith had no comment at press time.

SBA delegate Cliff Martins said, "Luckily the French Embassy folks were cool and let the party continue."

Write-On Competition for First-Years

By MELISSA R. HODGMAN

Attention all 1Ls: the write-on is coming! Each spring the seven law journals at Georgetown Law at the University of the District of Columbia Legal towering competition to select their staffs for the following year. After finals, first-year students are eligible for membership in a journal. To be considered for membership on a journal, a student must participate in the legal writing competition. The writing samples will be returned to them and offers will be made based on the writing samples and other criteria which vary by journal.

Scheduling of the Write-On Competition

The packets will be sold outside of the Chapel in the main building and first years are encouraged to pay by check. Evening Division students may purchase the packets on May 17, 1993 from 3:30 to 11:00 p.m. Their completed submissions are due on June 1, 1993 between 2:00 and 5:00 p.m. Day students may purchase their packets on May 18, 1993 between 12:00 and 3:00 p.m. and their write-ons are due on May 29, 1993 between 10:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. The completed packets may be submitted in person by mail. Further, the packets will specify times prior to the deadlines stated above when the completed write-ons may be submitted.

As the first years hand in their submissions, each journal will post the write-ons to their packet stub. After all of the completed write-ons have been collected, a list of who submitted entries to which journals will be posted in the main building. This will allow everyone to confirm that their work has been received. The list will be in packet number order, but there will be no indication of the social security numbers.

Each journal's current staff members will evaluate the write-ons over the summer. Then, in August, the journals will send invitations to prospective writers, as well as posting the list of the social security numbers or packet numbers of the invitees in the main lobby of the Law Center.

What the Write-On Entails

Each packet contains a "case in issue" and all of the research materials necessary to complete the write-on. No outside research is necessary or allowed. The materials will be provided in the case at issue, other relevant cases, statutes and law review articles. Based on these materials, the student is expected to write a well-organized, thoughtful analysis of the case. Submissions will be limited to no more than nine pages of text and three pages of appendices.

The Benefits of Membership

Being invited to the staff of a journal does more than just boost your resume; it provides an opportunity to make friends, improve your writing skills, and maybe even get published. Further, the journals promote discourse and debate by offering an opportunity to meet students with similar interests. Students are expected to submit a note during their tenure on the journal. Many of these notes will be published and some will satisfy the student's B paper credit requirement.

A brief description of each of the journals follows:

The American Criminal Law Review (ACLR): founded in 1979, publishes articles, notes, and comments on all aspects of criminal law, its annual White Collar Crime project provides a survey of new developments in that area of the law. The American Criminal Law Review is the only student-edited journal in the country that specializes in immigration. Articles and notes address current issues in domestic and international immigration law and policy. Their Current Developments section keeps subscribing practitioners abreast of recent legislation and case law in the field.

The Georgetown Immigration Law Journal (GIELR) focuses on national and international trends in environment law and policy. Further, the GIELR summarizes notable legislation and topical foreign publications.

The Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics (GJLE) publishes the only journal in the country devoted solely to legal ethics and professional responsibility.

The Georgetown Law Journal is considered one of the most prestigious in the country. It is the oldest journal on campus and publishes in all areas of the law.

Law and Policy International Business (LIPB) publishes articles analyzing the economic, legal and political aspects of international trade and finance. LIPB, which is affiliated with the International Law Institute, will celebrate its 25th year of publication next year.

The Tax Lawyer is an official publication of the Section of Tax of the American Bar Association which also carries student articles. With a circulation of over 30,000, The Tax Lawyer has the largest readership of any student-edited journal in the country. The Journal focuses on recent developments in the field of taxation, and the tax consequences in virtually all areas of law.

More information about the journals and the write-on process will be provided in the Journal Town Meeting scheduled for April 13, 1993 at 3:00 p.m. and April 14, 1993 at 2:45 PM. BLSA, APALSA and the Alliance will hold a student meeting with the journals on March 31, 1993 at 3:30 p.m. Further, there will be a reception following the April 14, 1993 meeting at which each journal will have a display table.

Although adding an extra week or two onto your first-year law school seems like the last thing you want to do, you will find that it is well worth your time and energy. This is your only chance to become a journal staff member because the competition is only open to first-year, even in joint degree candidates must apply even if they choose to defer their membership for a year.

Graduation Gala Set

By HENRY BLAKE

After weeks of delays, the graduation ceremony specifics have finally been set. The school decided to put together a special committee made up of students, faculty and alumni this year in an attempt to have a graduation that people will want to attend. It seems that over the last couple of years attendance of both students and parents has been meager and the complaints from those who did show up were many and harsh.

The special committee (Graduation Planning Committee) started meeting way back in October to plan the graduation events that will take place this May. The committee interviewed 3Ls and recent graduates to find out exactly what went wrong in the past and how to make this year's graduation the best ever. Dean Heurich, Chairperson of the Graduation Planning Committee, said, "We've really worked hard to put together what we believe is a graduation gala that is exactly what the students want. Our decision to make some last minute changes came after we read in the Law Weekly that very few student are planning to give any money to the school after they get out. We think that we can make up for the misery they have suffered over the last three years by throwing one hell of a big party." Listed below are some of the major events planned for this year's graduation:

First, graduation has been changed from May 31st to Saturday, May 19th, and will be held at the Kennedy Center. "We decided to change the date because so many students were upset about having to hang around for two weeks after finals for the ceremony," said Heurich.

Third-year student Delores King said, "I doubt I'll go even if they change the date, I don't have a job and I'm really depressed about it. I just don't know what I'm going to do." This feeling was echoed by John Tuttle, third-year, who said, "How am I going to change my plans this late in the game? I already bought an airline ticket to go back to Iowa to work on my uncle's farm. I can't change my plans now just to go to a stupid graduation ceremony." When told of these comments, Heurich said, "To hell with them, We're going to have a big party and if those cry babies don't want to come, I couldn't care less!"

Based on a survey taken of third-year students, the committee has decided to have the following entertainment at the graduation gala: three live bands, a wet t-shirt contest, 16 male strippers, 100 kegs of beer, playboy centerfolds, the Dallas Cowboys Cheerleaders, Andre the Giant fighting Hulk Hogan, Arnold Schwarzenagger, the cute guy from "Full House," several of the stars from 90210, Christina Applegate, G. Gordon Liddy, P.J. O'Rourke, Karate guys breaking boards, a chainsaw juggler, six fortune tellers, 2 DJ's, an open mike where students can take turns making announcements, and a giant water balloon fight. "We had planned on having the same old program of boring speakers like we always do, but after talking to students we decided to give them exactly what they wanted, and these are the suggestions that came up the most in our survey. Admittedly it will be a big break from past tradition, but we're more concerned with throwing money from the graduates than with being politically correct," said Heurich.

The live music will be provided by Mary J. Blige, Bebe' Rexha, and Above The Law. "We think we've got a fine line up of live entertainment that will please most of the crowd," said committee member Jenn Cresswell, GULC '92, "the DJ's will play some country western music and whatever rock stuff people want to hear." Third year student Mary Beth Watson said that she had never heard of two of the acts and that she was shocked at the committee's choices. "What in the hell do they think they are doing?" said Watson.

The thing about the gala that will probably shock most students is the fact that they will have to pay to go. "In order to comply with all the entertainment requests we had to go way over budget and, as a result, we cannot afford to let everyone come for free," said Heurich. Tickets go on sale Friday, April 2nd, outside the Chapel. Tickets are $25 for graduates and $30 for family members and students (with ID). Anybody else (they are advertising the party on various radio stations to make sure ticket sales are high) can pick up a ticket for $35 in advance and $40 at the door. "Considering the amount of entertainment provided, and the fact that the beer is free, we expect to sell out well before the 19th," commented Heurich.

When told of the plans for the graduation gala, one student, who wished to remain anonymous, said "bitchin'!"

Next Law Weekly Issue:
April 19th.

SWITCH TO PIEPER

IT'S NOT TOO LATE!!!!!

Pieper Bar Review will credit ANY MONIES put down with another course (up to $300). All you have to do is send in proof of payment with your Pieper application. It's that simple!!!

So don't wait...call now!!!!!!

(Offer ends April 16, 1993)

Don't lose money because of a foolish mistake!!!!! If you were lured into another bar review course by a slick sales pitch, there is a way you can get out now without losing money.

1-800-635-6569

Pieper Bar Review 90 Willis Ave. Mineola, New York 11501

WHEN YOU RIDE DRUNK, ONE MORE FOR THE ROAD CAN HAVE AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT MEANING.

Alcohol quickly affects your judgment, balance, and coordination. Don't drink and drive. Or your last drink might be your last drink.

Motorcycle Safety Foundation
GABE'S TV TALK!

By GABE GONZALEZ

By now, I'm sure you've all heard that I've been named the new head of NBC News. In the wake of that whole "Dateline NBC" fiasco, but not to worry, I will continue to fax my column to the editors of the Law Weekly.

This week, I review the Oscar telecast, which I'm sure everyone will agree was full of surprises. The show started routinely enough, with a dance number featuring Sir John Gielgud, Pia Zadora, and Gavin MacLeod, who wowed the audience with their unforgettable choreographic interpretation of Harvey Keitel's masturbation scene in "Bad Lieutenant." Then, things started to fall apart.

Billy Crystal, angry because the Academy did not nominate him for "Mr. Saturday Night," refused to host the show at the last minute. The crisis was averted, however, when Jack Nicholson agreed to do it for $23 million. When this change led to Anjelica Huston dropping out as a Best Supporting Actor presenter, Shannen Doherty saved the day by volunteering to sub for Huston.

For a while after that, things went according to plans, with "Beethoven" winning Best Picture and Corey Feldman winning Best Actor. But, when Shannen Doherty went to present the Best Supporting Actor award (which would eventually go to Rob Lowe for "Wayne's World"), all hell broke loose. Seated in the fourth row of the Dorothy Chandler Pavilion, Jennie Garth and Tori Spelling took out their semi-automatic and gunned Doherty down.

You can just imagine what the splattering blood did to Michelle Pfeiffer, who had the bad luck of wearing a white dress and sitting in the front row.

After Spelling and Garth were given impromptu Special Achievement awards by the Academy, the nominated songs for Best Original Song were performed. "Beautiful Marle of My Soul," from Membo Kings, "Friend Like Me" and "A Whole New World," from Aladdin, and "I Have Nothing" and "Run to You," from The Bodyguard, were all performed by Debbie Gibson, who brought the crowd to tears.

Finally, the award of the evening, Best Actress, came up. Who would win? Pfeiffer, who was in the bathroom trying to get the blood out of her dress? Catherine Deneuve, who hoped that voters had forgotten her Youthgarde commercials of several years back ("Come closer.")? Mary McDonald, who hoped that voters had missed her in that CBS sitcom of a few years back with Elliott Gould, "EH?"? Emma Thompson, who had already won so many awards that she offered to buy Tina Louise's Beverly Hills home just for the storage space? Susan Sarandon, who got pregnant just for the occasion?

No, the surprise winner was a write-in candidate: Whitney Houston, for The Bodyguard. Houston's win was eerily reminiscent of her character Rachel's win for Queen of the Night in The Bodyguard. Russell, who was celebrity correspondent for Entertainment Tonight, yelled to Houston, "Work it, Whitney." Houston, obviously moved, used the occasion to announce her divorce from marital singer, Bobby Brown, and her marriage to Alfonso Ribeiro, of Fresh Prince of Bel Air, who she met when she guested on Silver Spoons years ago.

Said Soleil Moon Frye, a front-runner for next year's Best Actress award for her performance in Lady Macbeth: The Musical, "It's moments like this that make me proud to be a member of the acting profession."

Smoke 'Em If You Got 'Em

By DINAH KANCER

GULC Students For Smoking (GULC5F) has convinced the administrators of the school that its policy of no smoking in classrooms, etc... is unconstitutional and should be repealed. Effective immediately the entire campus is now "smokeable." Dean Chow said, "We had no choice. Those damn smokers are a bright bunch of students. They found some case law that we just could not ignore and, as a result, we have to allow them to smoke their smelly cigarettes anywhere they want. I don't like it, but what am I going to do?" Another administrator who wished to remain anonymous commented, "I hate those guys. They smell like old moldy clothes. We can only wish they all drop dead, and quick!"

The smokers on the other hand had a quite different reaction to the recent announcement. One student simply lit up five cigarettes and shouted "Yeah Boy!" Another commented "Now I can light up anywhere I damn well please! That's how it should be! I can't wait until finals!"

Prof. ARTHUR MILLER

Live at GULC

on First Year Civil Procedure Saturday, April 3rd 9:30-4pm

For Registration Information Call BAR/BRI 202/833-3080

barbri

Have a nice Spring Break.
Howdy! Welcome to the seventeenth issue of THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW, Vol. V, No. 1. THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW again prematurely (yet confidently) reports the fantastic and stunning success last week of the BAR-RISTERS' BALL, which was rescheduled due to the Blizzard of '93. My date looked absolutely ravishing, and her date had tied his own bowtie. The music sounded great, almost as great as THE GRATEFUL DEAD's third show at the Cap Center last March 18th, which was truly out of this world, especially when observed from the "Phil Zone."

THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW proudly presents this week's winning Haiku, penned by none other than former Chief Justice Howard Taft, also the President, our nation's only two-fer:

Moran v. Burbine
who is accused
of the murder of the
uninvited lawyer.

THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW apologizes for its inadvertent political incorrectitude in last week's issue—an overzealous copy editor evidently changed our progressive reference to Congresswomen and "Senators" into the unrepentant "Congressmen and "Senators." We promise to endeavor in the future to make sure this kind of thing won't happen again.

THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW imagines that not a few of its readers have often wondered why virtually all the judicial opinions they've ever read have been uniformly poorly written. No doubt, this can be attributed in part to the fact that most judicial opinions are written by judges (or their clerks), and hence by LAWYERS, individuals who often are frustrated writers who either lacked the talent or courage to follow their hearts in pursuit of their true love— the Muse of Writing. Despite the best efforts of their dedicated and devoted Law Fellows, many of these judges never quite got the hang of COMPONENT PARAGRAPHS and when they got to the bench, they lapsed back into their bad writing habits. And the writing doesn't appear to be improving with time, although the great masters of confusing obfuscations and tortured prose passages like Cardozo and Holmes are thankfully long dead and buried, hopefully never to rise again. Therefore, THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW offers the following modest proposal: RECYCLE OLD JUDICIAL OPINIONS!!! Whatever you might need to write in your judicial opinions has probably been said many times before and has probably been said better than you can say it anyway, the overall lousy quality of most legal writing notwithstanding.

Further impetus in the direction of recycling bits and pieces from old judicial opinions may be found coming from the Un civilized Legal Studies movement recently launched by THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW. Realizing the fundamentally indeterminate nature of all adjudication and all so-called "Legal Reasoning" and "Legal Analysis," and hence the arbitrary and capricious, one might even say whimsical, nature of any given judicial outcome, the fledgling school of Unrational Legal Studies scholarship recognizes that the textual judicial outcome itself, as presented in the context of the casebook, is as valid as any other outcome that any given clever, nihilistic Harvard-educated or Yale-educated law professor could hypothetically hypercritically hypothesize. Thus, Black Let-
er Law salvaged from old judicial opinions is no more, nor less, valid than Gray Letter Law tailored out of whole cloth.

To illustrate, THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW presents a sample judicial opinion that somewhat resembles a rag quilt of recycled bits and pieces from old judicial opinions basted loosely together with strategically placed segues sentences:

HOLDING: The United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) did not in LeGrice misinterpret Robinson and the holding of the United States Supreme Court in Cohn v. United States Corset Company. The CCPA held in LeGrice that:

"The mere description of the plant is not necessarily an 'enabling' disclosure. Such descriptions, just as in the case of other types of inventions, in order to bar the issuance of a patent, must be capable, when taken in conjunction with the knowledge of those skilled in the art to which they pertain, of placing the invention in the possession of those so skilled."

The descriptions of the new roses in the instant publications, are incapable of placing these roses in the public domain by their descriptions when interpreted in the light of the knowledge now possessed by plant breeders. The cases disclosed in the appealed publications can construct and operate it without experiment and further exercise of inventive skill. Unless a publication possesses all these characteristics, it does not place the invention in the possession of the public, nor defeat the claim of its reassignment to a patent. It is Robinson's 9th characteristic of a prior publication with which we are here concerned. This characteristic is further elaborated in Sec. 330 of Robinson on Patents entitled "Prior Publication: Publication Must Fully Communicate the Invention to the public," which states the rule as follows:

"Finally, the description must place the invention in the possession of the public as fully as if the art or instrument itself had been practically and publicly employed. In order to accomplish this, it must be so particular and definite that from it alone, without experiment or the exercise of his own inventive skill, any person versed in the art to which it appertains could construct and use it." [Emphasis ours.]

The court pointed out the errors of the examiner and the Board of Appeals:

"In holding that the publications here in issue constitute a legal bar to a granting of patents on the rosa floribunda plants described in the applications here on appeal, we think the examiner and the Board of Appeals disregarded what we have found to be the legally imposed limitations on the meaning of the clause 'described in a printed publication' in section 102(b) in the prior cases in which the courts have interpreted the clause in determining whether a particular description in a publication will constitute a statutory bar to the grant of a patent. We think the board and the examiner were incorrect in overlooking these cases and interpreting the clause 'described in a printed publication' in section 102(b) according to what the examiner called 'its exact and unequivocal meaning.' When used in the Patent Act of 1992, this clause had acquired in the context in which it is used in section 102(b) something other than an 'exact and unequivocal meaning' as a result of the judicially imposed limitation that this clause requires that the description of the invention in the printed publication must be an 'enabling' description. Our study of the prior cases which have imposed this interpretation on the clause indicates that the proper test of a description in a publication as a bar to a patent as the clause is used in section 102(b) requires a determination of Continued on page 9
whether one skilled in the art to which the invention pertains could take the description of the invention in the prior art and, armed with his own knowledge of the particular art and from this combination be enabled to make the invention on which a patent is sought. Unless this condition prevails, the description of the invention is inadequate as a statutory bar to patentability under section 102(b).

With respect to Patent Cor, the examiner and the board that created this 'anomaly' when dealing with plant patents, the requirement that plant publications must be totally ignored as printed publications was not intended to apply to patent applications. "In view of the long time of cases dealing with other types of inventions, it is not inconsistent with the law requiring the plant publications be totally ignored as printed publications was not intended to apply to patent applications."

"** Each case must be decided on its own particular facts in determining whether, in fact, the description in the printed publication was the basis for patentability in the invention and thus bar patentability of a plant under the conditions stated in section 102(b)."

Id. at 938-39.

"The board relied heavily on Cohn v. Cor, in which which in the solicitor's brief has been characterized as "the landmark case on which the Cohn relied upon for support for the assertion that the "overwhelming weight of the decisions in this area is that a clear and unambiguous description in a prior publication is sufficient under the law to bar a subsequent inventor from obtaining a patent on the identical thing." That the Cohn case did not so hold seems cleer to us." at 940.

"[T]he court noted in a footnote: "**** It should be borne in mind that we are here dealing with an abstract per se, not in a printed publication of applicant own roses, whereas in the Cohn case, the description of the patented publication was that of an invention made by a prior inventor, thus in the Cohn case there was no bar to the Cohn case is dealing with a situation covered by 35 U.S.C. 102(a) rather than the technical bar of 35 U.S.C. 102(b).""

Id. at 940.

"Referring to the Johnson disclosure, the court stated (p. 370): "It is, therefore, fatal to the validity of the plaintiff's patent if, in fact, it does not sufficiently the manufacture described and claimed in his specification. It must be admitted that a printed publication and published description does exist and that the invention in such a full and intelligible manner as to enable persons skilled in the art to which the invention relates to comprehend without assistance from the patent, or to make it, or repeat the same. It is insufficient to invalidate the patent." [Emphasis ours]."

The thrust of the Cohn decision as we see it is:

"** The evidence shows that the Johnson specification, in connection with the known state of the art at the time of the application, was sufficient to enable one skilled in the art of corset-making and of the use of the jacobard to make the patented corset." (93 U.S. at 377.) Emphasis added.

It is in the light of these comments by the court that the true significance of the statement, which appears in the Patent Office and numerous cases quoted as to the holding in the Cohn case, can be determined. The court said (p. 377):

"It is quite immaterial, even if it be a fact that Johnson's specification is sufficient to teach a manufacturer how to make the patented corset, it must be in such a form that when it is produced and published, it is unequivocally clear, therefore, is, whether the prior publications described the art to be infringed. To defeat a party for infringement, it is sufficient to plead and prove that the thing patented to be infringed is shown to have been patented or published in some printed publication prior to his supposed invention or discovery thereof. ** ** ** It is for the court to determine whether the patentee was clearly described in 1856, in the printed publication of the Johnson (Gerasme) provisional specification.' (Emphasis added.)

The court throughout its opinion in the Cohn case directly referred to those skilled in the art and, the knowledge which they possessed. We think it is because of this knowledge, and thereby because of this knowledge, that the court said the 'important inquiry, therefore, is, whether the prior publications described the art.'

Id. at 940-41.

The court concluded: "We therefore hold that descriptions in printed publications of new plant varieties, before they may be used as statutory bars under U.S.C. 102(b) must be met the same standards which must be met before a disclosure in a printed publication becomes a bar in non-plant cases, 35 U.S.C. 161 does not contain any limitation on this interpretation of the clause 'described in a printed publication,' and Congress has not otherwise provided.' When so considered, the descriptions in the printed publications here in issue do not meet the requirement of an 'enabling' of description, as the statute has been interpreted in numerous cases. The Board of Appeals stated in its decision below that "it is no more absurd to use a disclosure which is not enabling as a bar than it is to grant a patent on such a disclosure; the disclosure in the specifications are admittedly just as unenabling as the disclosures in the printed publications." The board of appeals to this apparent anomaly lies in 35 U.S.C. 162 in which Congress 'otherwise provided' by specifically allowing for such a disclosure in plant patent applications. No such allowance has been made in 35 U.S.C. 102(b) with reference to the sufficiency of the description of new plant invention in patent applications."

"Another answer to this apparent 'anomaly' is implicit in 35 U.S.C. - 163. The plant patent grant differs from that given with respect to other inventions. Infringement to a roll or must be shown of the same was in Reproduced or used or sold the plant on which the patent was granted. ** ** ** This section implicitly recognizes there is no possible production of the plant from a specification as 35 U.S.C. - 112 now, the other conditions of a patent.

Id. at 944. To this we again add the rest of the conclusions of the court: "The more description of the plant is not necessarily an enablie disclosure. Such descriptions, just as in the case of other types of inventions, in order to bar the issuance of a patent, must be capable, when taken in conjunction with the knowledge of those skilled in the art to which they pertain, of placing the invention in the possession of those so skilled.

The descriptions of the new roses in the instant publications are incapable of placing these roses in the public domain by their descriptions when interpreted in the light of the knowledge now possessed by plant breeders. The roses disclosed in the printed publications are not, therefore, 'described in a printed publication' within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 102(a)."

Id. at 944.

Aply, the court wrote that: "of the rose floribunda plants here in issue thus appear to be something more than Gertrude Stein may have observed when she wrote 'Sacred to Emily' that 'a rose is a rose is a rose is a rose.'"

Id. at 938. As William Shakespeare had the fair maid Juliet observe, "That which we call a rose, by any other word would smell as sweet, especially if exquisetly reproduced from the rose floribunda plants here in issue.

Believe it or not, actually handled in the above opinion to my employers, partners in a well-known and well-respected Intellectual Property Law firm in Boston, as an exercise for a seminar on Patent Law. The only comment I received back was, "Very clever. You know what's wrong with us."

Finally, THE GEORGETOWN LAW REVIEW wishes everyone a Happy April Fool's Day, and commemorates the occasion by reprinting the April Fool's Day Contract that was used successfully last year in Professor Spann's Contracts class:

APRIL FOOL'S CONTRACT

Agreement made this thirty-first day of March, 1992, between various and sundry members of the Contracts class of Professor Girardieu A. Spann (hereinafter called "the parties of the first part") and other various and sundry members of the Contracts class of Professor Girardieu A. Spann (hereinafter called "the parties of the second part").

Witnesses

Whereas the parties of the first part have taken sufficient notice of the propinquity of their beloved members to wear Oxford button-down shirts, blue jeans, and a corduroy jacket to class consistently, to doff the said jacket at first appointed time after the beginning of said class, and to roll up his sleeves to wear Oxford button-down shirts, blue jeans, and a corduroy jacket to class consistently, to doff the said jacket at first appointed time subsequent to said first appointed time; and

Whereas the second part have also taken studential notice of the propensity of their beloved members to wear Oxford button-down shirts, blue jeans, and a corduroy jacket to class consistently, to doff the said jacket at first appointed time after the beginning of said class, and to roll up his sleeves to wear Oxford button-down shirts, blue jeans, and a corduroy jacket to class consistently, to doff the said jacket at first appointed time subsequent to said first appointed time; and

Now, therefore, in consideration of the covenants and agreements herein made, the parties agree as follows:

I. Recitals The above recitals are incorporated by reference herein and are made hereof as if set forth verbatim.

II. Performance The parties of the first part hereby agree that tomorrow, April 1, 1992, April Fool's Day, they will wear Oxford button-down shirts, blue jeans (or close approximations thereto, including, but not limited to, Pareto effictent breaches), and corduroy jackets (or close approximations thereto, including, but not limited to, tueed jackets) to class, and will doff said jackets at said first appointed time after the beginning of said class, and will roll up their respective sleeves at a second appointed time subsequent to said first appointed time; and the parties of the second part hereby agree that tomorrow, April 1, 1992, April Fool's Day, they will wear Oxford button-down shirts, blue jeans (or close approximations thereto, including, but not limited to, Pareto efficient breaches), and corduroy jackets (or close approximations thereto, including, but not limited to, tueed jackets) to class, and will doff said jackets at said first appointed time after the beginning of said class, and will roll up their respective sleeves at a second appointed time subsequent to said first appointed time; and

III. Specific Performance It is expressly agreed that this Agreement shall be enforceable in equity by specific performance.

In witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names:

April Fool's Day
EJF Fund Drive

By MARY HOGAN

From March 25 through April 2, 1993, members of the Equal Justice Foundation and the 32 applicants for the Summer Fellowship Program will be asking the GULC community to make donations to support students who work in public interest jobs during the summer. Throughout the fund drive, donations and pledges will be accepted at a table outside of the chapel. All of the money collected will be used to provide stipends for GULC students who take unpaid or low-paying jobs with public interest organizations.

During the fund drive, EJF will accept cash or check donations. Those who want to give money but find themselves running low on funds at the end of the term can make a pledge to pay their donation in July.

Those who donate to the fellowship fund select the recipients of the fellowships by voting for projects at the time they make a donation. For a minimum donation of $28 for ILs, $45 for 2Ls or $65 for 3Ls, graduate students and faculty, donors can vote for the two projects they believe to be most worthy of funding. Although the ballots do not contain the names of the student applicants, the word descriptions of the projects written by the applicant are available at the EJF table to help voters decide which projects to vote for. EJF also encourages students to make a "1% for Justice" pledge by pledging 1% of their summer income to the fund drive.

In the past, the great generosity of the Georgetown community has made GULC's fellowship program one of the most successful in the nation. Last year, 17 fellowships were funded, and, in 1991, 16 fellowships were funded. This fellowship program helps not only the GULC students who receive the fellowships but also allows organizations to provide services for clients who might otherwise have to be turned away.

Organizations that have received funding in the past include the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Legal Department, the Children's Defense Fund, Legal Services for the Elderly, Ayuda, Amnesty International, the National Center for Law and the Deaf, United States Attorney's Office - Narcotics Division and the Women's Legal Defense Fund.

To make your donation and cast your vote or to get more information about the fellowship program, write to the EJF table from 10 a.m. - 7 p.m. during the fund drive. A complete list of this year's projects and past recipients is available at the table.

Weekly Crossword

"April Fuel's Day" By Gerry Frey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Across</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. April fuel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Light bulb gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kitteh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mr. Guthrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sister's alias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The &quot;E&quot; in HOMEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. April fuel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Nice head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Macy's Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Waiting chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. January vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Greeky-Style sandwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Gen. Tel. &amp; Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Restroom sign: 2 wds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Bed parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. April fuel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Surround sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Atlanta arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Halk dumply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Shoshonean indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Light-colored horse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nice cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unfull Stress material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Draft board ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Boombek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Nice summers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Foundry workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Festive celebrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Conscience verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. April fuel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Bliss &amp; white cookie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Matter object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Formerly famously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Father of Mathewlah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Two fold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Write for another?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Twisty city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Sea eggers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Three area necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Archaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Bad reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Part of G.E.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Choir member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Guided trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Doctor's org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bro or sis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.possibly enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Across</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48. Florida product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. M. Bombek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Nice summers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Foundry workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Festive celebrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Conscience verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. April fuel?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Bliss &amp; white cookie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Pres. of Yugoslavia 1956-1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Matter object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Formerly famously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Father of Mathewlah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Two fold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Write for another?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Twisty city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Sea eggers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Three area necessity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Archaic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Bad reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Part of G.E.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Choir member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Guided trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Doctor's org.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bro or sis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Possibly enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ARAB AMERICAN LAW STUDENTS ASSOCIATION

of GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY PRESENTS

ARAB-AMERICAN CELEBRATIONS

* "THE HISTORY OF ARABS IN AMERICA," LECTURE AND SLIDE PRESENTATION BY DR. ALIZA NAPP, FOUNDER OF THE NAPP ARAB AMERICAN COLLECTION, NATIONAL MUSEUM OF AMERICAN HISTORY SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
* LUTE PERFORMANCE BY RAMALLAH'S OWN FIAD FOYT
* VARIETY OF ARABIC FOODS AND REFRESHMENTS

TUESDAY MARCH 30, 1993
7:30 P.M.
INTERCULTURAL CENTER AUDITORIUM, MAIN CAMPUS
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Hello, I'm Wenwick. I'm a law student with a conservative viewpoint just like most of you. Georgetown has too many liberal yahoo profs and it's high time we take a little fun at them.

How to really annoy your liberal hippie loving law professors:

Unfortunately I'm too damn busy with tax journal work and Federalist Society meetings to finish this cartoon. Feel free to draw your own little doodles in the space below. I'll see you in the library! Bye now!
FIND OUT WHAT'S GOING ON with the NEW YORK & NEW JERSEY BAR EXAMS THIS SUMMER The Dates Have Changed Again!!

Ask Stan Chess, President NY BAR/BRI Thursday, April 1st 1:20-2pm, Room 206

Get advice on taking 2 bars, where to study this summer, what bar to take

JOIN YOUR BAR/BRI REPS FOR PIZZA & HAVE ALL YOUR ???'S ANSWERED 202/833-3080
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Federalist Society Hosts Judge Williams

By SCOTT SHUDA

The Federalist Society will host a presentation by Judge Stephen F. Williams of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on Wednesday, March 31, 1993 at 3:30 p.m. in room 156. Judge Williams will be speaking on the application of law and economics to tort law entitled Second Best: The Soft Underbelly of Deterrence Theory in Tort. Judge Williams is a 1981 graduate of Harvard Law School and was appointed to his current position by President Ronald Reagan in 1986.

This will be the final event in what has been a banner year for the Federalist Society. During the first semester, the Society hosted a speech by former Attorney General Edwin Meese on the legacy of the Reagan administration, a presentation on tort reform by Assistant Attorney General, Stuart Gerson, and a presentation by Chicago Law Professor Richard Epstein on curriculum reform efforts within legal education.

Earlier this month, the Federalist Society co-sponsored a panel forum with La Allanzia on the topic of multiculturalism in education. The featured speaker at this event was Linda Chavez of the Manhattan Institute.

The Federalist Society attempts to sponsor events that are of interest to the entire law school community. Federalist Society events are widely publicized and anyone interested is encouraged to attend and participate. This event complets with the Society's desire to foster debate and discussion on the great legal and political issues of the day while exposing students to the individuals currently shaping American public policy.
Res Pendens

Areen's office commented that "we have worked too damn hard to get into the top ten to have it all ruined by a bunch of no good drunks, drug addicts and generally unstable students."

Notice: Professor Cohn has requested that students either bring enough beer for everyone when they come to class or don't bring any at all.

Professor Greenhalgh is looking for summer research assistants. Candidates must be able to put up with constant ranting, raving and general unpleasantness, and be able to tolerate listening to boring stories of yesteryear. Interested students should slip their resume under his door and screen.

Georgetown Outreach is still looking for students who feel as though putting stuff on their resume like "I made 10,000 IHOB love notes" will help them get a job. GO has decided to start a program called "Law Students For a Well Informed Homeless Shelter" (LFWHS). Interested students should purchase as many newspapers as possible and bring them to the GO office. The papers will then be stacked outside the local shelters doors in the middle of the night.

Remind students to get their clocks back 1 (one) hour this Friday night at 1:00 AM. This change is pursuant to a proposal of requests from students with 9:00 AM classes who "just can't seem to get there on time."

Career Services

Attention Jobless Third Year!

The Office of Career Services will be holding a mini Job Fair on April 1, 1993 for third year students still searching for permanent position this fall. The fair will include a small deacon's estate firm from American, Georgia; a three-attorney firm specializing in parking law for clients in Massachusetts; and a small firm specializing in legal name changes from Provo, Utah. Each firm has one space open for a new associate, and will also be interviewing at Harvard, Columbia, NYU, GWL, Howard, American, Virginia, and Duke law schools. These are the only remaining jobs in the country, so sign up now.

Attention First Years!

The Office of Career Services is proud to announce a new symposium on finding a job in the legal field, called "Your Family Tree: Is There an Attorney in Your Closet?" Over the years, the office has found that more first year gets jobs from relatives and familial acquaintances than any other method. This symposium will help you trace your family tree through Martinlade Hubble in search of a legal job.

Employment Surveys

Each graduating student is reminded to fill out an employment survey, which the school just really, really, really needs to maintain its federal funding. Anyone not filling out the form or caught lying on the survey will be prevented from graduating, and will have to attend one more semester at GULC. These students will be forced to take the following schedule: Constitutional Law II with Father Drinan, Professional Responsibility with Father Drinan, International Human Rights with Father Drinan, and a different section of Professional Responsibility with Sherman Cohn.

Public Interest Jobs

Jobs serving the public interest are useful and nice, but we really don't have the time right now to help you find anti-materialist find silly little jobs representing the homeless or women's rights or something like that. Because if we did, we'd have to change all our sample letters to include something besides large law firms. Further, if more people take jobs in the public interest, then GULC's $70,000 a year starting salary average would fall and people would think that GULC wasn't any better than University of Pennsylvania, which is not even in the same country as News and World Report's Top Ten law schools. If you want public interest, join a clinic and get it out of your system. This office only serves the serious law students.

Office Of The Registrar

Class of 1993 § 4

The Registrar is proud to report that Torts professor Howie Latin has been found hiding in Waco, Texas. He has bar- ricaded himself inside a small house and is said to be heavily armed. He is holding your Torts exam hostage and refuses to grade them until Dean Areen offers him a job at GULC. Some progress is being made, though; Prof. Latin has grown a beard and no longer scares small children with his "smiling" face.

Inclencement Weather Policy

There is no inclencement weather in the forecast for the rest of the year, and even if a hurricane of snow came by and dropped a foot in blizzard conditions, this school would never close its doors. A legal education is much too important to disrupt just because the entire East Coast is completely shut down in some silly snow storm.

Prof. Weidenbruch Spring Exams

Students taking Tax II or Decedent's Estates with Professor Weidenbruch are hereby informed that Professor Weidenbruch's exams this spring will be closed-book essays covering mostly theoretical material. Anything Professor Weidenbruch says to the contrary in the classroom is just a joke. No one would actually use the same basic fill in the blank exams for the past twenty years.

Job Opportunities

Professor Silas Wasserstrom is looking for a female student willing to come over to his house twice a week and "wash all that chalk off my clothing. Look, I don't know how it gets there." Student will earn $8.50 an hour from GULC and could receive special bonuses from Prof. Wasserstrom. "Look, look, I don't know what goes on in my house."

Professor Chal Feldblum is seeking a Jewish or Arab-American law student to teach her students how to correctly pronounce her first name. The student may also be asked to introduce her at faculty meetings and Congressional hearings.

Professor Peter Edelman needs a student to eat and sleep for him, now that he has no time for such mundane tasks. The former assistant dean's busy full-time schedule includes at GULC, the White House, and HHS keep him from resting and performing his normal bodily functions. The student would be connected to Professor Edelman by transfusion tubes and would need to follow him around everywhere. This position is not paid, but Professor Edelman promises a job with Bill or Hillary (student's choice) at the end of the semester.

Professor Gary Peller has an opening for one law student to follow around Professor Mark Tushnet and criticize anything Tushnet says or does. Knowledge of Constitutional Law is unnecessary; the student just needs to keep on saying: "You're out of touch, you establishmentarian old fool! June Cleaver was right!" Student will be given a bonus for any recanting on the usefulness of narrative discourses by Tushnet.

Professor Paul Rothstein needs one student with a videotape machine to catalogue and document Rothstein's numerous appearances on CNN and other news broadcasts. The student will be charged with the responsibility of determining whether Professor Rothstein has actually said anything significant on the air in the last three years.

The Admissions Office needs a student to insert the words "Named "10th best law school in the nation" on every piece of mail going to anyone applying to GULC. Student must also be willing to answer phones in the following manner: "Hello, Georgetown Law, TOP TEN SCHOOL, may I help you?"

---

Lorenzi

---

Disorientation

---

Kernaghian

---

Gore